



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

The remaining fault of Miss Morgan's study is mechanical. The double bibliography seems to me of questionable value, and the print is unnecessarily high. Lowering of the type, with a consequent compression of the bibliography and an elaboration of the content of the study would have been far better.

Nevertheless, *all* deductions made, Miss Morgan has added much to our knowledge of the English novel. The value does not, as the *Nation* perversely declared, lie in the bibliography. And Miss Morgan's modesty contrasts well with Professor Dibelius's self-confidence.

A. J. TIEJE.

*University of Illinois.*

---

SIR PERCEVAL OF GALLES: A STUDY OF THE SOURCES OF THE LEGEND, by Reginald Harvey Griffith. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois. Postpaid \$1.35.

It takes rare courage to venture into the mazes of the Perceval-story, even if one thinks to make a straight path for himself as he goes. This courage Professor Griffith has possessed, but he has avoided the complications of the Grail legend, with which the Perceval-story is so closely bound up, by taking for his point of departure the English *Sir Perceval of Galles*, which contains no grail. The volume consists primarily of a careful analysis of the *Sir Perceval of Galles* into twenty-eight incidents, which fall into five large groups. Group by group and incident by incident, the English romance is compared with those portions of the remaining representatives of the legend which contain corresponding elements, and with Celtic folk-tale analogues. The consequence of this procedure is that the book has a somewhat formidable appearance and is rather difficult reading, since numerous tables and lists are made necessary. Nevertheless the mechanical process encourages the reader to feel that the author is making no evasion, that he is seeking simply the truth about the matter; and it enables the reader—conveniently, if not without pains—to retrace the steps by which the author reached his conclusions. The reviewer can claim no competence to deal with the details of the discussion, which will in time be passed upon by those most concerned, but will restrict his remarks to certain general aspects of the study.

Professor Griffith begins his study with a characteristically modest, if somewhat misleading statement: "The problem to which the following pages address themselves concerns the origin of the mediaeval English poem *Sir Perceval of Galles*, whether or not it is the offspring of a

romance composed in French by Crestien de Troyes and now commonly known as *Perceval le Gallois, ou le Conte du Graal*." A convenient summary of previous scholarly opinion is given (pp. 7 ff.), and an attempt is made to reach a final result through a more minute and orderly arrangement of the material for comparison. Professor Griffith's conclusion, that Crestien's romance is not the source of the English *Sir Perceval*, seems quite justified by the evidence—consisting chiefly in the numerous features common to *Sir Perceval* and other versions of the legend, which do not appear in Crestien. This opinion coincides with that of Miss Weston, and has been widely accepted in the past, although Golther's early opinion to the contrary one must suppose unchanged (cf. *Die Gralsage bei Wolfram von Eschenbach*, Rostock, 1910).

However, the study is much more ambitious than the first statement would indicate. In attempting to show that there is no necessity to go to Crestien for the material which entered into the English romance, the author is led to a fairly complete scheme of the development of the Perceval-story. The inclusion in the diagram (p. 128) representing this development of Crestien's romance, Gerbert's Continuation, *Peredur*, and the *Parzival* of Wolfram von Eschenbach is made, I presume, for the sake of completeness, since the relations of these versions are not to be determined by a study which professedly ignores part of the material. But the attempt to trace the evolution of the story to the stage represented by *Sir Perceval* is serious, and is, in fact, the main contribution of the book. Celtic folk-tales are used to trace the probable steps. First, Professor Griffith finds that there was a frame tale consisting of an account of the rearing of the hero in a forest by a mother who wishes to prevent him from becoming a knight and of an adventure in which the hero rescues a distressed lady and wins her for his wife. This stage is represented in folk-lore by *Fool* (Campbell, *Popular Tales of the West Highlands*, III, 160-193). Into this frame are absorbed successively the Red Knight-Witch-Uncle story (represented by *Red Shield*, Campbell, II, 451-493, and in *Sir Perceval* by vv. 481-1056); the Tent Lady-Giant story (*Sir Perceval*, vv. 417-480, 1817-2104; also *Ivain* and *Lady of the Fountain*); and "Saracen Influence" (involving a modification of the significance of certain incidents and a change of geography). That is, *Sir Perceval*, and with it *Peredur*, represents the fourth stage in the development of the Perceval-story. The analysis made by Professor Griffith is thorough, but it is hardly reasonable to suppose that his evolution will be generally accepted. After all, the folk-tale analogues are

sometimes both scanty and remote (as Professor Griffith confesses); and can one say more than this: that in *Sir Perceval* are contained elements which either did exist, or well might have existed, separately? If it is impossible for scholars to agree as to the relations of well-preserved versions, such as Wolfram, Crestien, and *Sir Perceval*, is it possible that they will agree on hypothetical versions represented by distant folk-lore analogues? Indeed, one must agree to the theory of the relation of the English and French versions before the further study would have any significance for him. Professor Griffith has only presented one possibility among many.

A suggestion in regard to the locality of the story and its possible independence of French originals is interesting but too tentative to receive very serious consideration. The writer believes "the territory extending from Carlisle (or Edinburgh) to Chester" to be the place where the Perceval-tale took form. The folk-tales out of which the Perceval-tale might have developed are in neighboring territory, and it was in this district, he thinks, that Celtic tales would be likely to reach English hearers. Moreover, the dialect of *Sir Perceval* belongs to this region. This evidence leads to Professor Griffith's conclusion that *Sir Perceval* is not derived from a French original, but that it is "simpler and more in accordance with all the evidence in the case to consider it an English singer's versification of a folk-tale that was known in his district of Northwest England." Opinions of this sort involve much more than the history of one story merely; they involve the whole question of the literary relations of Celts, English, and French. However, until generally accepted views of these relations are modified, and until a thorough study of the folk-tale analogues of the Perceval-story shows that Professor Griffith's implied limitation of their geographical distribution is justified, the very obvious resemblances of *Sir Perceval* (dated by Griffith 1370) to French Arthurian romances of much earlier dates in names, in motives, and in atmosphere, seem decidedly in the way of the acceptance of the suggestion.

Professor Griffith acknowledges frankly the objections to this opinion as well as to others advanced by him. He is himself so cautious in his statements and so modest in his claims that one must admire his disinterested spirit. Moreover, work done so thoroughly and carefully is certain to be helpful in future investigations. Every page bears witness to the painstaking accuracy with which the material was prepared for the press. And the author has, I think, shown that it is unnecessary to go to Crestien to find material out of which the English *Sir Perceval* might have developed.

*University of Illinois.*

HERBERT LE SOURD CREEK.